CHANNA ALLEDS PETRUS

1

2 3

4 5

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

> 24 25

26

27 28

DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR

FEES AND COSTS - 1

Honorable Franklin D. Burgess

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

LLERO-I LIKUS,	
)	No. C08-5533 FDB
Plaintiff,)	
)	DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR
)	FEES AND COSTS
RECOVERY GROUP,)	
)	NOTED FOR APRIL 24, 2009
Defendant.	
	Plaintiff,) A RECOVERY GROUP,)

Comes Now, Columbia Recovery Group, and moves for the following relief:

I. RELIEF REQUESTED

On March 24th, this court granted Columbia's Motion for Summary Judgment

27

28

dismissal of all of Plaintiff's claims. Columbia requests attorney fees and costs pursuant to Rule 11, 15 U.S.C. § 1692K and FRCP 54(d)(2).

AUTHORITY

Plaintiff sued Defendant under the FDCPA, which provides:

On a finding by the court that the action under this section was brought in bad faith and for the purpose of harassment, the court may award to the defendant attorney's fees reasonable in relation to the work expended and costs.

15 U.S.C. § 1692K(a)(3)

In addition, Rule 11(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires that in all representations to the court an attorney conduct "an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances." FRCP 11(b). Under Rule 11, a court can impose an "appropriate sanction upon the attorneys, law firms or parties." FRCP 11(c).

Rule 11 also provides that attorneys presenting pleadings, motions or other papers (i.e. response and reply briefs) are "certifying that to the best of the person's knowledge, information and belief" that the documents are not being presented for an

DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR FEES AND COSTS - 2

27

28

improper purpose, such as . . . to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation, [FRCP 11(b)(1)] and further certifying that "the allegations and other factual contentions have evidentiary support[.]" FRCP 11(b)(3).

The record herein contains ample evidence that (1) this suit was filed without sufficient inquiry by FDCPA counsel as to whether Allers-Petrus had disclosed her claims to the bankruptcy court, (2) Allers-Petrus made contradictory representations to two different courts, and, most egregious (3) Allers-Petrus chose to keep perpetuating the misrepresentation after the summary judgment motion was filed, rather than dismiss this case, her counsel should have withdrawn rather than assist her in this endeavor.

It is this last conduct that is the most troubling: Allers-Petrus made blatantly false statements in her amended schedules to the Bankruptcy Court and counsel herein attached those schedules as exhibits to the Responsive brief, in support of her opposition to summary judgment.

Both counsel and Allers-Petrus had to know that the amended schedules contained false statements, as they, together, sent Columbia demand letters prior to the bankruptcy filing. To thereafter present, to this court as evidentiary support, documents

DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR FEES AND COSTS - 3

asserting that Allers-Petrus "became aware of (FDCPA claims) after filing bankruptcy" is a blatant violation of Rule 11.

By filing false schedules and opposing the Motion for Summary Judgment, Allers-Petrus and her counsel caused Defendant to incur an additional \$1,161.00 in attorney fees, because their behavior compelled Columbia to object to the amended schedules and reply to the Response. A total of \$5,516.25 in attorney fees has been incurred through April 6, 2009.

In *Terran v. Kaplan*, the Ninth Circuit upheld a district court's order awarding fees and costs pursuant to Rule 11. In *Terran*, the Plaintiff had filed his claims without the reasonable inquiry required. By doing so, Kaplan was compelled to prepare a defense to the invalid claims; Rule 11 sanctions were therefore proper. *Terran*, 109 F.3d 1428.

Similar to *Terran*, the case at bar should not have been filed in light of the original bankruptcy schedules demonstrating no claims or suits. Allers-Petrus actively pursued the inconsistent positions, obtaining a confirmation of her Chapter 13 plan in Bankruptcy Court while serving initial disclosures and propounding discovery in the case at bar.

DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR FEES AND COSTS - 4

9

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27

28

containing false representation, and her counsel, knowing the information in the amended schedules was untrue, nonetheless submitted these schedules as support for her objection to Summary Judgment, causing Defendant to incur additional fees.

III.

CONCLUSION

Defendant's Motion, Allers-Petrus perpetuated the fraud by filing amended schedules

Furthermore, even after the inconsistent positions were brought to light through

Defendant requests attorney fees pursuant to Rule 11 in an amount to be determined by this court.

DATED THIS 7th day of April, 2009.

LUKE, CASTEEL & OLSEN, PSC

/s/ Kimberlee Walker Olsen Kimberlee Walker Olsen, WSBA # 28773 Attorney for Defendant

DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR FEES AND COSTS - 5

2 3

4

5 6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27

28

DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR FEES AND COSTS - 6

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

- I, Kimberlee Walker Olsen, certify that on April 7, 2009, I electronically sent, via ECF, true and correct copies of:
 - Defendant's Motion for Fees and Costs/Note on Motion Calendar; 1.
 - 2. Declaration of Defendant's Counsel in Support of Fees and Costs; and
 - [Proposed] Order Granting Defendants' Motion for Fees and Costs 3.

to the following:

Jon N. Robbins, Alex Weisberg Weisberg & Meyers LLC jrobbins@attorneysforconsumers.com aweisberg@attorneysforconsumers.com

Z:\Client Files\KWO\Columbia Recovery\Allers-Petrus 7colum.04\def motion for fees and costs.wpd